

REMARKS

The amendments to the specification filed on 2/28/2005 were not entered since the amendments did not comply with CFR 1.121. In this response, the specification has been amended in compliance with CFR 1.121 to include the amendments to the specification previously filed on 2/28/2005. These amendments correct typographical errors and do not add new matter. As such, the amended specification is now believed to be in proper form.

The abstract of the disclosure was objected to because of the use of the term “The present invention.” In this response, the abstract has been amended so that the abstract refers to “The invention” rather than “The present invention.” No new matter has been added. As such, the abstract of the disclosure is now believed to be in proper form.

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) with respect to claim 67. In this response, claim 67 has been canceled. As such, the drawings are now believed to be in compliance.

The disclosure of the specification was objected to because of specific informalities referenced by the Examiner. In this response, the specification has been amended to correct all of these specific referenced informalities, which only correct typographical errors and do not add new matter. Moreover, the specification was objected to as failing to provide antecedent basis for the term “cleaning surface” in claim 46, and antecedent basis for the recitation of screws in claim 67. In this response, the first sentence of the paragraph at page 9, lines 3-4 of the specification has been amended to clarify that a cleaning surface such as a scrubber 100...may be releasably secured to the mop head 22. A scrubber 100 is clearly a cleaning surface, which is also shown in the drawings, and as such, no new matter has been added. Claim 67 has been canceled. As such, the disclosure of the specification is now believed to be in proper form.

Claims 47, 49, 51, 82, 84, 108, and 111 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner stated that claims 47, 51, 82, and 111 defined the “cleaning surface” as an absorptive surface/sponge which was considered to be new matter; and that claim 108 defined the mop head as having an opening to receive the attachments defined in claim 107 which was considered to be new matter. In this response, claims 47 and 82 have been amended to take out the reference to an “absorptive surface”; claims 49 and 84 have been amended to take out the reference to a “brush”; and claims 51, 108, and 111 have been canceled. As such, the referenced claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim 85 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In this response, independent claim 81, from which claim 85 formerly depended, has been amended to include the limitations of former dependent claim 85. As such, amended independent claim 81 is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 46 was formerly allowed. In this response, claim 46 has been slightly amended to specify that there are a plurality of cleaning members, and that each cleaning member is adapted to be releasably secured to the mop head in a substantially different plane than the cleaning surface. This amended limitation is similar to a limitation in amended claim 81 which was found to be allowable. As such, amended independent claim 46 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 51, 67, 85, 108, and 111 have been canceled in this response. Claims 1-45 and claims 69-80 remain canceled. Claims 47-50, 52-66, and 68 each depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 46, and as a result are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 82-84, 86-107, and 109-110 each depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 81, and as a result are also believed to be in condition for allowance.


In this response, new claims 112-114 were added. New claim 112 comprises formerly rejected claim 1 with the additional limitation of a cleaning surface in a substantially different plane than the cleaning member. New claim 113 comprises formerly rejected claim 22 with the additional limitation of a cleaning surface secured to the mop head, wherein the first cleaning member is adapted to be secured to the mop head in a substantially different plane than the cleaning surface. New claim 114 comprises formerly rejected claim 67 with the additional limitation of a cleaning surface in a substantially different plane than the cleaning member. These additional limitations are similar to limitations in independent claims 46 and 81. As such, claims 112-114 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference is necessary.

Date: 11/21/2006

Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon, LLP.
205 W. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: (312) 201-2721
Fax: (312) 201-2555

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Timothy K. Klintworth
Registration No. 46,162